

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

WB

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

		•		
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,080	11/29/2004	Jun Shinozaki	MEIC:182	9658
27890 7590 08/08/2007			EXAMINER	
STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP 1330 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20036		WILLIAMS, JOSEPH L		
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				#
			2879	
		•	•	:
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/08/2007	PAPER .

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/516,080	SHINOZAKI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit .				
	Joseph L. Williams	2879				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>11 May 2007.</u> 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-6 is/are pending in the application Papers Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-6 is/are pending in the application is/are withdraw is/are allowed. [6] Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-6 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. [7] Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or application Papers	vn from consideration.					
· · <u> </u>	-					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) D Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary					
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment and response filed on 11 May 2007has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noriyuki et al. (JP 04-365349), in view of Kazuo et al. (JP 2000-001771) and Hide (JP 2001-316797), all of record.

Regarding claims 1 and 5, Noriyuki ('349) teaches in figures 1 and 2 a method of forming film on a substrate (no number), the substrate held by one of a plurality of substrate holders (T), and repeatedly using the plurality of substrate holders to form film on a substrate, at least one substrate holder is coated with film from forming the film on the substrate.

Noriyuki ('349) does not disclose that the film is used in a plasma display panel, that the film is made in an evaporating room, or at least one holder in the evaporating room is not coated with the film.

Further regarding claims 1 and 5, Kazuo ('771) teaches a film being made for a plasma display in a chamber (2, read evaporating room) for the purpose of improving the density and increasing the release coefficient of the secondary electrons.

Art Unit: 2879

Kazuo ('771) does not disclose the at least one holder in the evaporating room is not coated with the film.

Further regarding claims 1 and 5, Hide ('797) teaches in paragraph 28 a method of making a film comprised of, in part, shields (11a, 11b) which prevent film from being formed on the substrate for the purpose of improving the ease of maintenance of the carriers.

Hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the shields of Hide with the chamber of Kazuo in the manufacturing steps of Noriyuki for the purpose of improving the ease of maintenance of the carriers and increasing the release coefficient of the secondary electrons.

Regarding claim 2, the number of substrate holders coated verses non-coated is an obvious choice in design, depending upon the required amount of film to be produced.

Regarding claim 4, Hide ('797) teaches in paragraph 28 a frame (16) retaining the substrate (17) and a dummy substrate (15) retained by another frame, and the film is removed from the dummy substrate.

The reason for combining is the same as for claim 5 above.

Regarding claim 6, Hide ('797) teaches in paragraph 28 the elements not coated with the film comprise at least a frame (16) retaining the substrate (17) and a dummy substrate (15) retained by another frame.

The reason for combining is the same as for claim 5 above.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, and 4-6 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph L. Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272-2465. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30 AM-3:00 PM).

Application/Control Number: 10/516,080 Page 5

Art Unit: 2879

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Joseph L. Williams Primary Examiner Art Unit 2879